



## Ethno-National Colonialism in South Africa

Ratau John Tshikosi; Livhuwani Priscilla Sekhula

Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education, University of Venda, Thohoyandou, South Africa

<http://dx.doi.org/10.47814/ijssrr.v4i3.96>

---

### **Abstract**

The purpose of this dissertation is to answer the question: why do ostensibly similar ethno-national conflicts within a system of settler-colonial domination see such wide variation in their outcomes? How they emerge from conflict through power sharing and social integration versus the endurance of separation and systems of domination and control? The study identifies causal paths that resulted in the decline of domination systems of this type. Ethno-national conflicts that feature certain similarities develop in different trajectories due to certain conditions that culminate in transforming the structures of these conflicts towards integration (the establishment of a single political entity) or separation (independence in separate entities). The goal of the dissertation is to examine the Palestinian-Israeli conflict through a comparative lens in order to specify the conditions that led to the persistence of the two-state solution and to examine the prevalence or lack of necessary and sufficient conditions for the emergence of a one civic-democratic state. Building on the comparative approach I argue that ethno-national territorial underpinnings of the conflict and the “regimes of territorial legitimation” of the dominant group are the most crucial explanatory factor in determining the trajectory and outcome of the conflict. “Regimes of territorial legitimation” are the practices, procedures, systems of meaning, and institutional designs that found the relationship between a nation, people or ethno-national group and geography/territory. The dissertation features a qualitative structured and focused comparison of the conflicts in South Africa, and Palestine. Method of difference is applied for a case-oriented interpretive inquiry that focuses on the complexity of each of the two cases and aims at capturing the historical diversity of these similar cases.

**Keywords:** *Ethno-National; Colonialism; South Africa*

### **Introduction**

The dramatic escalation of the conflict in South Africa in 1970s and 1980s reflected an advanced stage of regime’s erosion and the downturn of Afrikaner nationalism. The rise of African nationalism within a deeply divided society indicated to a dynamism that would have led to the total collapse of the state (Horowitz 1991). Indeed, the increased levels of violence between the years 1984-1992 and the rise of a African nationalist and anti-apartheid civic-democratic movements on the one hand, and regime’s oppression on the other made the sustainability of the regime more costly. Moreover, regimes regional failures and international increased pressure that turned South Africa into a pariah state. R. W. Johnson

(1977: 314) remarks that regimes police strategy in dealing with anti-apartheid movement, and its regional setbacks that stemmed from regimes aggression undercut its ability to endure. The eclipse of apartheid also marked the downfall of Afrikaners' racial ethno-nationality as the basis of political life and socio-economic privileges.

The latter represented the essence of apartheid regime as well as the source of Africans' discontent and resentment that led to the convergence of African nationalism and civic democratic organizations on the objective of thwarting apartheid. At the point where African nationalism was gaining the higher political and moral ground, the regime of racial-ethnic domination was losing ground. Dan O'Meara (1996: 136) maintains that "by the end of 1977, virtually all commentators were agreed that on the burning issues of economic, social, and political policy, behind the overt face of hard-line control and repression, the government was virtually rudderless" (O'Meara 1996: 136).

The erosion of Afrikaner domination, however, started long before the 1970s as this chapter argues: apartheid collapse was a staged process that accompanied and sprung from the very structures of exclusion, territorial separation, and domination systems that were based on racial differentiation and premised on Afrikaner ethno-nationalism as the defining essence of state system. However, the contradictions and weaknesses of the racial-ethnically based regime rendered its sustainability rather precarious. Historical developments that led to the collapse of apartheid and the establishment of a non-racial democratic regime makes the case of South Africa illustrative for the purposes of our research: unveiling the conditions under which a racially base ethno-national conflict resulted in an integrative outcome. Thus our analysis addresses the conditions; structural and contextual that culminated in the collapse of a failing regime of ethno-territorial domination.

As such the inquiry here is not concerned with the process by which the regime and the Africans' national movement negotiated the provisional democratic transition; we emphasize the premises upon which the parties came to negotiate an integrative, unitary political entity that would preserve South Africa as one nation.

Initially, the conflict in South Africa was rooted in a settler-colonial enterprise that was characteristic of settler-colonial type of domination discussed in our conceptual framework. However, Afrikaners' regime territorial ideology and the 'regimes of territorial legitimation' it adopted were not conducive to the construction of the whites as an ethnic core that is united and coherent to create and sustain a white South Africa.

Moreover, dynamics of partial exclusion and exploitation contributed significantly to the failure of the regime to ethicize the conflict by ethnically homogenizing the African people and the white society that was divided between Afrikaners and English-speaking communities. There are four major explanations for the rise of Afrikaner nationalism to power, its racial-colonial tenets, and the dynamics that led to its demise: (1) emphasizing ideology as the main driving force of racial-colonialism apartheid in 1948 (e.g. Jan J. Loubser 1968, p 379-80, and W.A. de Klerk 1975); (2) Economic explanations that focus on economic imperatives and the contradictions (especially exploitation and production relations) they created in the establishment and the collapse of apartheid (e.g. Legassick 1974); (3) racist-colonial analyses that focus on white domination as a system of institutionalized unequal distribution of resources and opportunities based on skin color.

Ultimately, this system aimed at the construction of white society with the Afrikaners in its core as a nation endowed with cultural and ethnic euphemism (Adam 1971: 33) and sometimes scientific discourse; (4) An eclectic perspective that looks upon socioeconomic structures and their dynamics as well as structures of meanings and subjective aspects of the conflict as determinant sets of factors that contributed significantly to the eclipse of white rule in South Africa. Herman Giliomee (1995, 1979) shows how structural factors: a weak demographic base, a dramatically different regional and

international conditions, and economic recession led to a serious debate within the white polity, which made the transition to democracy conceivable.

### ***Discussion***

This research takes into account the dialectical relationship between two main sets of factors: the relationship between structures of territorial legitimation and separation, and systems of domination on the one hand and the certain events and interactions between the adversaries on the other, as combined forces that led to the staged demise of white rule in South Africa. The apartheid regime represented a rational group dictatorship of a collective social entity justified and partially driven by ethno-national ideology of racial differentiation, which was by and large mutable and adoptive to socioeconomic and political power shifts. Therefore, what accounts more is to pinpoint the features and the unique forms of racial segregation and apartheid as domination systems of a settler-colonial society seeking to reconstruct itself into ethno-national people. The causal chain that led to the demise of white domination rule is found in four principal factors:

First: the inability of the regime to create a valid separated territorial ideology accepted externally and ceded internally. Afrikaners' regimes of territorial ideology' were contingent, instrumental and indeterminate;

Second: the persistence of white cleavages that prevented coherency and unity based on an ethnic core that may have gained the properties of a nation/people;

Third: the minority status of the white society undermined its ability to sustain domination as an ethnic-territorial group; and Fourth: indeterminate territorial ideology and lack of ethnic unity had yielded two weaknesses: first the dynamics of exclusion and exploitation showed contradictory consequences that gave Africans a political leverage, and second divisions and weak ethno-territorial identification generated the inconsistency of the ideological justifications and mobilization especially in 1960s and 1970s. Weaknesses and inconsistencies were worsened by the rise of African nationalism starting early 1960s. African nationalism challenged the kernel of Afrikaner objective manifested by Bantustan policy and showed that Africans have maintained their sense of national identification with South Africa.

The following empirical interpretations examine these factors through a process tracing method within a historical deep description narrative of the development of the conflict from colonial segregation to separation and apartheid as outlined in the introduction chapter of this research.

Afrikanerdom; Afrikaner ethno-national ideology was shaped and developed its political aspiration for power within a dual conflict: (1) a conflict with the British colonialism and English-speaking settlers that resulted in the wars of 1880-1 and 1898-1902. However, the convergence between British colonial interests and Afrikaners' ambition for statehood yielded the establishment of the Union of South Africa in 1910; a new member of the Commonwealth that would serve British objectives in the region. Taking over the keys of power in the new state divided the white colonial communities; Afrikaners and English-speaking settlers. White cleavages have remained a salient challenge for the regime that compromised the unity and cohesion of the white polity and amounted in governments' inability to "achieving complete political hegemony over society as it was much more difficult for the government to take action against white opponents" (Guelke 2005: 23) who possessed considerable economic, cultural and political power.

This structural condition will affect regime's pursuit of ultimate domination and shall hinder the efforts to construct a white ethno-nationality as one nation; (2) the conflict with the indigenous black people and other 'Coloured' groups who struggled for their right of self-determination, which had been a great challenge to white domination and a core factor in its eclipse.

Internal challenges and external uneasy relationship with a colonial superpower founded the historical initial conditions that determined the main properties of the state as a settle-colonial construct. The Union of South Africa (read the Union) represented a system of state power based on racial differentiation. For the Afrikaners state power was the main source of political power that would enable them to establish their hegemony as a distinct ethno-nationality vis-à-vis other whites and in the face of the indigenous Africans. For a small minority (in 1904 the white community was roughly one-third of the population) capturing state power was a decisive condition for their supremacy in social, economic and political spheres of life. The state in this context was born outside and against the will of the majority of South African society whose exclusion and subordination was a necessary condition for the success of white settlers' enterprise.

However, the foundation of the state, although externally imposed by Britain, had maintained the territorial integrity and contiguity of South Africa as a single country. The implications of political-territorial demarcation of the state would have fundamental effect on the political-geography of the conflict with the African national movement. The Union gained recognition as a modern state within this condition. Thus, slicing the territorial or spatial spheres of the country would be too costly for the regime while a system of segregation and exclusion would take a racially-based scheme whereby territorial segregation is instrumental in serving other supreme goals and objectives.

Although racial prejudice and segregation prevailed in the 18th and 19th centuries prior to the establishment of the Union, it was fragmented as each of the four European colonies enacted its own policies and measures. Lack of conformity in racial policies was fostered by geo-political fragmentation of Afrikaners' 'republics' and British presence that blocked the emergence of a solid Afrikaner collective identity. Afrikaner identity emerged as a colonial-nationalist articulation of scattered settler groups in their fight against the natives for resources, and as a self-proclaimed anti-colonial (British) domination. The formation of the Union was welcomed by the Afrikaners as a perceived bottom-up process of state building that they were entitled to control in order to protect their interests and self-proclaimed national identity which otherwise was conditioned by frontier (inland struggle for a foothold) conditions; a period that is out of the scope of our study and aptly covered in many studies (e.g. Giliomee 1979, Giliomee 2003, Worden 2000, Adam 1971, and Thompson 1995). The Frontier conditions are considered, in some accounts, to have shaped Afrikaners' deep sense of distinctiveness as a nation superior to natives and distinct from English-speaking white settlers in their struggle for political power within a racially defined context.

White society in general was the locus of domination, coercion, and disdain of non-whites especially following the discovery of gigantic reserves of minerals in the interior. White settler, supported by the British colonial power became superior vis-à-vis the Black Africans (Guelke 2005: 56-58). Capturing the interior turned the settlement enterprise of white Europeans into extremely brutal and inhuman practices. Hobson (1900: 53) describes modes of coercion, subordination and enslavement of the indigenous and taking over their lands which placed them "in such a position of political and economic weakness that they are unable to refuse wage work upon terms offered by white masters." The conditions Hobson depicts, in agreement with most of his contemporaries<sup>9</sup> had created the foundation for formal policies of colonial rule in which territorial separation and segregation served a racially defined socio-economic system of differentiation and subordination. However, the economic imperative coupled with political power considerations were also combined with ideological justifications and other typical European colonialist notions. Other explanations recognize the effects of the frontier as the structure within which Afrikaners' racial practices developed.

Ideological explanations focus on Afrikaners' Protestant Calvinist<sup>10</sup> belief that the Afrikaner community constructs a Chosen Biblical people. This ideology remained salient and represents a major source of Afrikaner ethno-nationalism. Thus B. J Vorster (South African Prime Minister from 1966 to 1978) pressed the messianic role of the Chosen Afrikaners by stating: "Yes, I believe profoundly, as

always, that we have been appointed by Providence to play a role here and we have the human material to play that role” (quoted in Adam and Giliomee 1979: 17). Afrikaner nationalism as a grid of ethno-religious thinking and ethno-national identity offers a plausible explanation of racial segregation and, for this matter apartheid. However, the effects of Calvinism and the Covenant ideology remain controversial in terms of the degree to which they shaped Afrikaners’ racial attitudes and policies.

Calvinism, beyond its religious prevalence, was a system of social and political affiliation that provided for integration and constructive social life. It provided for the demarcation and safeguarding of the relationship with the other may it be the indigenous or the other white British settlers. Thus Calvinist ideology was a politico-religious system of differentiation with political implications based on cultural supremacy of a nation in mission to carry on a divine mandate to redeem the culture of Voortrekkers (the pioneering settlers in the frontier) and reduce the heathens (as Afrikaners described the Africans) to a position of perpetual servitude (Du Toit 1983: 920).

Calvinism had fulfilled political, cultural and social functions that shaped Afrikaners’ self-conception and distinct identity as an ethno-national people. Calvinism was functional in drawing the lines of relationship between the Afrikaners and other peoples according to their racial biological origins. The effects of ideology were intertwined with typical European secular colonial notions of modernization that introduced Afrikaners as a civilizing force. Both discourses converged to produce a single practice characterized with conquest of the indigenous people and taking over their land (Du Toit 1983: 920) while segregating them to maintain distinctiveness.

The colonialist-secular nature of Afrikaner’s racialism becomes striking when we move from racial attitudes of individuals to social sphere where the structures of social relations unveil the political nature of racism in a colonial setting (Adam and Giliomee 1979: 20). The functional nature of Afrikaners’ Calvinism indicates its mundane origins; Afrikaners’ minority status resulted in high levels of anxiety, which made security and the privileges accrued from unity and conformity paramount.

Cohesion and conformity are crucial for the sustainability of the social system of domination and racial segregation that protected white supremacy. Indeed, once well established, Afrikaners’ notions of nationhood and distinctiveness were a major source of political thinking and mobilization that bolstered racial discrimination and segregation as the base of political power and domination, and for social supremacy. In this sense Afrikaner ethno-nationalist sentiments was an adaptive response to particular opportunities as well as new exigencies of the prevailing socio-economic and political conditions at the eve of establishing the Union and along the track that led to apartheid.

To be sure, Afrikaner nationalism was not articulated and materialized as an organized political force until the last decade of the 19th century. Afrikaner Bond that was established in 1881 as the first political expression of Afrikaner national unity was indecisive in its politics as to whether or not it would attract the votes from groups (Giliomee 1979:101) other than the Afrikaners. Afrikaners’ racism and political organization was the product of a sphere of struggle within the white society and between the whites and native Blacks. The construction of Afrikaners as an ethno-nationality had to endure this structural difficulty of Black African existence as an overwhelming majority and the privileged English-speaking white competitor. Thus, the term Afrikaner itself was an exclusive that applies to white settlers of Dutch or Huguenot descends and Afrikaans speaking persons who believed in the common cause of Afrikaners as a nation.

The salience of Afrikaner ethno-nationality in this sense exacerbated the divisions within the white society and among Afrikaners as segments of them supported unity with British while Afrikaner nationalists sought independence from British influence: this cleavage would prevail until 1948 when the Nationalist Party ascended to power. The rise of the white as a distinct ethno-nationality based on the notions of Afrikanerdom remained blurred, weak, and adoptive to the developments in the social and, socio-economic, and political spheres at certain historical contexts (Giliomee 1979: 83).



Ideological underpinnings of Afrikaner ethno-national identity were immutable, protean and subject to political power configurations and socioeconomic changes related to shifts in the economic system of exploitation intertwined with the sought for political power.

Afrikaners' racial colonialism was shaped under the conditions of the 'frontier' conditions that created what Du Toit (1983: 931) conceptualize as the "Degeneracy Paradigm". This syndrome depicts how Afrikaners' morality had been by the harsh struggle for viability to the extent whereby demonizing the indigenous was inevitable. Thus lack of morality and religious constraints drove Afrikaners' racial prejudices rather than religious impulse. Moreover, the minority status of the Afrikaners –and whites in general- generated another syndrome: security dilemma. Confining indigenous Blacks and dominating them can be seen through this lens (Loenberg and Kaempfer 1998: 31).

Perceptions of security threat worked on two levels: separating the non-whites and solidifying Afrikaner identity; both processes required a certain degree of political power and institutional arrangements. Afrikaners' ability to practice such a power in per-state period relied on the geographical isolation they had in their barren colonies from a central government. In the inland colonies Afrikaners exploited, by brutal means, the indigenous for their own material interests especially as forced and cheap labor. Therefore, ideas of national destiny and mission can be understood as a rationalization of expansionist and greedy actions.

Ironically the Homeland policy made Africans more aware of their mutual faith as one native people and a majority ethno-national group under the rule of a minority group that is self-identified as a racial ethnicity. Separation and exclusion dynamics made Africans more conscious about the injustices inflicted upon them by the white society. In spite of governments' oppressive laws and measures African opposition to apartheid only increased and gathered momentum.

Apartheid came to dismember an already long entrenched South African identity of Africans. The dynamics of partial exclusion and the levels of economic integration and undetermined regimes of territorial legitimation of the segregation era resulted in a strong African identification with South Africa. Democratization rather than liberation and ethno-territorial self-determination prevailed especially in 1980s with the emergence of mass democratic anti-apartheid movements that coalesced with the ANC to further consolidate this inclusive African identification.

Although in early 1960s organized black opposition was smashed, African resistance was resurrected in the 1970s through 1980s more persistent to achieve the end of apartheid (Posel 199: 1). The main African militant opposition during this period came from three politically organized movements: Black labor unions, the alliance of the ANC and CPSA, and the popular democratic mass movement of the 1980s. South African apartheid regime relied heavily on large and powerful arsenal of security laws and orders, and had launched unprecedented assault on its political enemies in the 1950s and 1960s in order to prevent the development of any effective and mobilized African resistance.

Thus the government illegalized and outlawed any actions of resistance to government policies<sup>41</sup>. However, oppression added to the grievances of the Africans and raised their militancy and will to mobilize. The 'defiance campaign' and the Sharpeville massacre of 1950s and early 1960s, although were limited and did not persist set the background for African nationalist movement politics and organization.

Following governments measures in 1950s the ANC adopted a 'Program of Action' that put forth the objectives of the struggle to end white domination and achieving self-determination through militancy and the use of mass protest including civil disobedience. The declaration was followed by the joint initiative by the ANC and the South African Indian Congress (SAIC) in 1959 to launch the Defiance Campaign against the injustice of apartheid (Guelke 2005: 94). The campaign was peaceful in a large measure and aimed at virtual 'violation' of government segregationist policies.

The campaign gave rise and political legitimacy to ANC and SACP as mass movements with a wide base of membership (Guelke 2005: 95) especially following ANC adoption of the “Freedom Charter” that drew the political philosophy of the movement as achieving racial unity and the reform of the state system on the bases of democracy and human rights. The charter established African nationalism’s consistent political position as nationally not ethnically driven movement; a feature that was further strengthened in the 1980s and had been a major factor in the failure of the regime to creating a white South Africa by ethnicizing Black community. However, this progressive position did not prevent the emergence of radical nationalist African movements. The more the government implemented apartheid measures and oppression the more rigid some African nationalists became. The leading example of this trend is the emergence of the Pan-African Congress (PAC) in 1959.

Banning the ANC and the SACP allowed the emergence of new Black movements such as “Black Consciousness’ in the early 1970 that was soon crushed as well. For the regime it was too risky to tolerate such a movement especially as black workers’ organization and activism started to regain momentum and self-confidence in the early 1970s. Economic changes of the 1960s and early 1970s that resulted in a significant increase in the employment of skilled and semi-skilled non-white workers and the ability of African workers to organize mass strikes<sup>42</sup> uplifted their bargaining power and organizing capacity, which represented a major platform for African nationalist struggle against apartheid in the 1970s and 1980s.

Government’s measures to restricting black workforce mobility and bargaining power had caused disruptions in the functioning of the economy and put whites’ interests on the line (Olson and Stedman 1994: 60). Moreover the resurgence of African nationalism in the region (in Rhodesia, Mozambique, South West Africa, and Angola) has complicated the South African regime’s status in the region and at home<sup>43</sup> ; a pattern that continued to collect momentum especially after the Soweto uprising of 1976 that reintroduced the question of ethnic racism and the failure of the Bantustans policy.

Practices of racism were materialized through a set of legislations in the Colonies that aimed at achieving two complimentary imperatives: to territorially separate Africans from white communities and simultaneously to provide for labor in mines and farms<sup>11</sup>. Colonial governments and local Afrikaner republics enacted several laws that separated black farmers from their lands. At one level Africans’ success in managing their own farms enabled them to compete with white farmers and in some regions black peasant farmers earned higher returns than white smallholders (Lowenberg and Kaempfer 1998: 33). Eliminating the competition was necessary for white economy to flourish. At another level, alienating blacks from the land was a modality of subordinated through which landless Africans were forced into a property-less labor in white-owned farms and mines (Lowenberg and Kaempfer 1998: 33) and to live in reserves at the periphery of white communities. Black workers were crucial for the performance of South African economy as cheap and manageable work force but at the same time they were perceived as a menace to Afrikaners’ sense of distinctiveness and the social order they espoused.

Thus, territorial separation and the creation of reserves was not the linchpin of racist colonial enterprise; it rather was instrumental although it exhibited certain ideological aspects to justify it. The main feature of territorial segregation until the enactment of apartheid in 1948, therefore, was the separation of residential areas that was perceived by Afrikaners and English-speaking whites in terms of “different geographical regions of white and black land settlement” (Rich 1990: 667). It did not show any profound territorial ideology beyond drawing the boundaries of Black communities in the low areas and regions that are clearly less developed, over-crowded, and stigmatized. To be sure prior to 1910 the main features of territorial segregation were determined by each of the four former colonies and republics, each of which “had pursued separate policies of residential segregation” (Christopher 1989: 421).

They had some conformity at specific aspects of segregation such as the colonies of Good Hope and Natal’s policy of denying citizenship and the right to hold land to all who were not officially white. The core issue of racist segregation was depriving non-white communities and especially the Africans of

all means of economic, social and political viability and simultaneously exploiting them. Social and political structures along a partial exclusionist policy that allowed exploitation. Partial exclusion, segregation, and exploitation would become systematic, formal, and consistent in the post-state era.

### ***Conclusion***

In early 1990's South Africa seemed to be at the brinks of chaos and collapse. The rising stalemate threatened the country with the danger of political vacuum that may have led to an all-out civil war or state failure. Negotiations seemed to promise the least evil for the adversaries since sustaining the status quo was perceived as a costly alternative that either party was prepared to accept. The stakes were high for both adversaries: for the Africans accepting racial-ethnic classifications and ethnically-based power sharing was anathema to their long and persistent struggle for restitution and justice in a democratic life. It also amounted to conferring legitimacy on a regime they fought to delegitimize and overthrow.

As a majority that identified with South Africa as a single country and nation, Africans possessed the political leverage to change the foundation of the state. Afrikaners on their turn sought to preserve the political power they obtained for decades as the main guarantor for their status and privileges; their ultimate fear was that a democratic majority rule will strip them of all privileges and status they possessed through racial domination over the majority of the population.

In spite of Afrikaner's efforts to transform their settler-colonial domination into ethno-territorial neo-racism through apartheid, African national movement's struggle and consistency coupled with international pressure had exposed the inherited weaknesses and vulnerabilities of the segregation and separation domination system.

First and most decisive, the regime couldn't find a permanent solution to the problem of the indigenous especially as the latter represents a strikingly vast majority of the population and has a crucial role in the economic system of the country. Nor were Afrikaners able to augment their minority status by any source of European settler groups of immigrants.

Second, South African regional surrounding remained elusive to control. South African efforts to impose hegemony in the region failed and the policies it implemented created a hostile region especially with the revival of nationalism in surrounding countries. Third, although white regime gained independence from Britain's direct influence and South Africa succeeded in constructing a strong economic and military state, international pressure only increased against regimes racial policies. These vulnerabilities affected directly and profoundly regime's ability to maneuver as it involved in the negotiations with the ANC.

The negotiations between the ANC and De Klerk's government was a struggle over the main features of the nation-building process in South Africa that will take the place of apartheid and white domination. On the micro level negotiating nation-building within the context prevailed in South Africa reflected the conflicting elements embedded in each party's perspective and political demands. However, on the level of macro conditions, and as the history of the conflict attests there were four conditions that sustained and deepened Afrikaners' regime vulnerabilities above-mentioned and led to the prevalence of the democratic solution and a nation-building that enshrines the rights and prerogative of equal citizenship in a unitary state system:

(1) The inability of the dominant group to form an inclusive nation-state out of the conditions at state formation moment: first, white population is a small and divided minority. The formation of a nation-state would have threatened Afrikaners status and their sought for political and social hegemony. However, the minority status and the lack of a strong ethno-national territorial identification impeded the



construction of Afrikaners as an ethnically-defined people; second, modern state in South Africa was formed within a territorially integrated geography whereby territorial legitimation of the state was bound to top-down institutional process based on racial differentiation. This constitution implied that the main goal of the state system as a settler-colonial project was aimed at managing the indigenous majority rather than shaping the state as a territorial and spatial construct. Thus state formation and territorial ideologies it espoused targeted the population of the subordinate group in order to preserve the dominant interests and status.

Afrikaners and white society cleavages had weakened the coherency required to constitute a well-defined ethno-national group. Moreover, the lack of clear and well demarcated territorial boundaries which the establishment of a white state would actualize. In fact Afrikaners on the level of elites and the populace –and to greater degree English-speaking whites- had shown weak territorial self-identification. Although Afrikaners possessed a significant degree of self-identification as a nation, they were not able to establish their entity as an ethnic core of a broader process of nation building. They were preoccupied more with establishing their political power position by controlling state institutions through which they guaranteed their domination over the non-white groups. In this sense the Union of South Africa was not a coherent nation-state that identify with solid territorial boundaries. As a matter of fact Afrikaner elites did not peruse a project of a nation-state; rather they espoused the perpetuation of a separated society.

The case of Afrikaners' rule shows that a minority in rule remains unable to establish a strong claim of territorial-national ideology that shapes the material and subjective bases of ethno-national political identity and institutions. This factor rendered Afrikaner identity and beliefs not fixated and the types of segregation and separation they practiced contextual. Furthermore, profound divisions within the white society between Afrikaners and English-speaking communities have weakened the claim of racial supremacy and prevented the articulation of a unitary white ethnic-national group. Even when the regime attempted to overcome this structural condition by collapsing the whites in a single group after 1948, Afrikanerdom was perceived as the hegemonic social and political power that provided the process with its tenets.

(2) The weakness of the national-territorial ideology as the bedrock of demarcating a well-defined nation-state was dialectically linked to the contextually established domination and separation systems deployed by the Afrikaner ruling elites. Since Afrikanerdom had never envisioned the establishment of a nation-state, territorial-national nexus lacked the driving force to be materialized and consolidated in state system and institutions. Afrikaners were mobilized on the bases of language during racial-colonial segregation era, and on the basis of their cultural identification as a *volk* during the 1939-1960s and at a very late stage they were mobilized and identified with the state *per se*. The belonging to a territorial nation-state arrived in a very late stage of ethnic-national constitution, which unveils the undetermined regime of territorial ideology of Afrikaners. Territorial separation at all phases of white domination was sought for its instrumentality and the political functions it provided and aimed at confining the Black community not for drawing institutional and normative boundaries.

Thus state contraction that was embedded in the Bantustan policy was implemented with minimum divisive consequences for the ethno-nation identity of the Afrikaners that was not linked essentially to territorial underpinnings. This is why in the 1970s Afrikaners were able to redefine their ideology and self-identification in order to redefine the core of their tenets that was perceived as immutable before 1970s events. Moreover, the weakness of the territorial-national nexus overlapped and at least partially explains the contextual nature of the systems of domination Afrikaners implemented in different phases of the conflict. As we discussed in details neither racial-colonial segregation policies nor apartheid represented integral systems and their modalities and organizational elements were associational; they were protean, adoptive, and at many levels pragmatic.

This characteristic allowed the gradual decay and erosion of the whole system as cracks within its edifice started to surface especially when challenged by a well-organized counter-hegemonic project of the African National movement, and faced external shocks; sanctions, castigation, and regional failures.

The indeterminacy of Afrikaner ethno-territoriality was further deepened by the partial integration of the Black African population in the white economic and to a lesser degree at different times- into the system. Exclusion in this sense was based on social differentiation of racial-ethnically defined grounds not on ethno-territorial grounds although it included territorial separation before and during apartheid. The dynamics of economic integration and exploitation mitigated the effects of segregation and territorial separation and enabled the African national movement to assume political leverage and to develop a strong sense of national belonging to South Africa as such not to territorially-defined affiliation. This factor maintained African struggle as a pursuit of democratization.

(3) The dynamics above-mentioned had diminished the ability of the dominant group to atomize their adversary and turn their struggle into a centripetal rather than centrifugal force. One of the main features of Afrikaner rule in South Africa was its failure to widen the colonial buffer that separated the dominant group from the rest of the population; the subordinate Black majority. Although the regime resorted to the three strands of power: disciplinary, bio-power, and sovereign power in order to widen and consolidate legal, social, political and territorial buffer of white settler-colonial society the dynamics of partial integration and the indeterminacy of territorial ideology rendered the buffer less effective.

Apartheid and 'homeland' policy represented the climax of this paradox: as segregation and other differentiation racial measures filed the regime attempted to homogenize the white race in a single territorially separated ethno-national group and atomizing the Africans into distinct putative ethnic groups. Apartheid, counterproductively have strengthened the sense of African collective national identity and sentiments of belonging to South Africa among African as a majority. African struggle for self-determination had shown a great deal of consistency in the sought for equality, justice, and self-determination in civic terms; a pattern that was strengthened and consolidated in the most decisive periods of the conflict in the 1980s when popular democratic elements of Africans' struggle prevailed.

(4) International legitimation that fluctuated through different phases of the conflict and in accordance with changes of world politics. The point at which international and regional effects against apartheid and white domination converged in terms of delegitimizing it and legitimating African struggle for self-determination, the regime couldn't endure the costs of sustaining white minority rule. The minority in a world where democratic notions of governance and the eclipse of colonization and authoritarianism lost all possible justification to protect its rule and it became clear that democratic transition is the least costly of all other alternatives; the most prevalent of which was a racial civil war that might have weathered a way all that white settlers accomplished.

### ***Bibliography***

- Adam, Heribert (1971). *Modernizing Racial Domination: South Africa's Political Dynamics*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
- Adam, Heribert and Hermann Giliomee (1979). *Ethnic Power Mobilized: Can South Africa Change?* New Haven and London, Yale University Press.
- Christopher, A.J. (1989). 'Apartheid and Urban Segregation Levels in South Africa', *Urban Studies*, Vol. 27 No. 3.
- Darby, John and Roger Mac Ginty (2003). *Cotemporary Peacemaking: Conflict, Violence, and Peace Processes*, Palgrave Macmillan, NY.

- De Klerk, F.W. (1998). *The last Trek: A New Beginning*, London and Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Donald L. (1991). *A Democratic South Africa? Constitutional Engineering in a Divided Society*, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, California.
- Du Toit, Andre (1983). 'No Chosen People: The Myth of the Calvinist Origins of Afrikaner Nationalism and Racial Ideology', *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 88 No. 4.
- Giliomee, Herman (1995). 'Democratization in South Africa', *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 110 No.1
- Giliomee, Herman (2003). *The Afrikaners: Biography of a People*, University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville, and Tafelberg Publishers Limited, Cape Town.
- Gordon, Neve (2008). *Israel's Occupation*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
- Guelke, Adrian (2005). *Rethinking the Rise and Fall of Apartheid*, Palgrave: Macmillan, New York.
- Gurr, Ted Robert (1993). *Minorities at Risk: A Global View of Ethnopolitical Conflicts*, United States Institute of Peace Press, Washington, D.C.
- Hannum, Hurst (2006). 'Self-Determination in the Twenty-First Century', in: Hannum and Babbitt (eds.). *Negotiating Self-Determination*, Lexington Books.
- Hannum, Hurst and Eileen F. Babbitt (eds) (2006). *Negotiating Self-Determination*, Lexington Books.
- Hartzell, Caroline and Hoddie, Matthew (2007). *Crafting peace: Power Sharing Institutions and the Negotiated Settlement of Civil Wars*, The Pennsylvania State University Press, Pennsylvania.
- Hobson, John Atkinson (1900). *The War in South Africa: Its Causes and Effects*, London: Macmillan, New York.
- Johnson, R.W. (1977). *How Long Will South Africa Survive?* London and Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Legassick, Martin (1974). 'Legislation, Ideology, and Economy in Post-1948 South Africa', *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 1 No. 1.
- O'Meara, Dan. (1996). *Froty Lost Years: The Apartheid State and the Politics of the National Party, 1948-1994*, Randburg, South Africa: Ravan Press, Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Rich, Paul. (1990). 'Peace, Science, and the Legitimation of White Supremacy in South Africa, 1902-1940', *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, Vol. 23 No. 4.
- Rich, Paul. (1996). *State Power and Black Politics in South Africa, 1912-51*, Basingstoke, Macmillan, New York.

## Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).